UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/646,850	08/22/2003	Uwe Mellenthin	E40.2B-11123-US01	1502	
	7590 07/19/201 TT & STEINKRAUS,	EXAMINER			
SUITE 400, 664	40 SHADY OAK ROA	DAYE, CHELCIE L			
EDEN PRAIRIE, MN 55344			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2161		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/19/2011	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/646,850	MELLENTHIN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
CHELCIE DAYE	2161		

	CHELCIE DAYE	2161	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>05 July 2011</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance w	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ad no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the size forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on the contract of the con	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be  (a) They raise new issues that would require further core  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the	isideration and/or search (see NOT w); er form for appeal by materially rec	E below); lucing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fails e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but</li> </ol>		•	
See Continuation Sheet.  12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).			
13.  Other:	====		
/Apu M Mofiz/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 3/29/11 was filed after the mailing date of the instant application. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Applicant argues, Brand does not suggest storing application-related data related to the proportioning device. Examiner respectfully disagrees. To begin, the applicant's specification gives an example of "application-related data" being usage data, which is data concerning the proportioned fluids (see par [0029] and [0054] of instant application). With that being said, Brand discusses data being stored in a database memory that is downloaded to any transceiver, wherein a usage of the device is built up in the memory (par [0026]) and the memory a dose memory for storing dosage data (par [0096]). Examiner interprets those citations to correspond to the storage of the application-related data, which is related to a proportioning device (par [0002]). Thus, Brand does in fact teach the above argued feature.

Applicant argues, there is nothing within Pipetman that discloses data about maintenance or repairing the pipettes having to be recorded; much less any hint by Pipetman to store such data in a transponder.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. To begin, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed.Cir.1986). In particular, Pipetman was relied upon for the disclosure of an example of application-related data being maintenance and/or repair data. The examiner believes Pipetman teaches this feature throughout its reference (pgs. 1-16), along with the fact that Pipetman is centered around pipettes and their performance and reliability.